

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. Independent claims 1, 13 and 18 have been amended. Claims 1 – 24 are currently pending.

Claim Objection

Claim 13 has been amended as suggested by the Office Action to cure the informalities cited by the Action.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1 – 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the independent claims have been rejected for lack of clarity concerning the phrases “a selected category of items” and “relational information indicates division.” Both of these phrases have been removed from the independent claims. As such, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the present rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1 – 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Thompson-Rohrlich, U.S. Patent No. 5,504,852 (“Thompson-Rohrlich”). Independent claims 1, 13, and 18 have been amended in response to the present rejection.¹ Applicants respectfully submit that Thompson-Rohrlich fails to teach the following aspects recited by the independent claims:

- “a display schema stored by said shell in association with said category of items, wherein said display schema identifies one or more display attributes selected as appropriate for display with items of said category of items.” [claim 1]

¹ Exemplary support for the present amendments may be found in the published application at least at paragraphs 106, 107 and 109.

- “a shell view schema stored in association with said relationship type” [claim 9]
- presenting “one or more display elements defined by at least a portion of the displayed items, wherein conflicts between said shell view schema and said one or more display elements are resolved in favor of said shell view schema.” [claims 9 and 18]
- “a display schema stored by a shell in association with at least one of said one or more queries” [claim 13]
- “a plurality of shell view schemas that are associated with one or more relationship types, wherein each of at least a portion of said plurality of shell view schemas identifies one or more visual elements selected as appropriate for display with items of one of said one or more relationship types” [claim 18]

With reference to the above quoted claim language, Applicants respectfully submit that Thompson-Rohrlich fails to contemplate storing a display schema that is associated with a particular category of items or a query, let alone a display schema having view attributes selected as appropriate for display with items of a particular category. Further, Thompson-Rohrlich is silent as to techniques for resolving conflicts between a shell view schema and display elements defined by an item. For these reason, Applicants respectfully submit that the independent claims are now in condition for allowance.

Thompson-Rohrlich discloses a computer system in which the stored files may be searched according to defined search criteria. For files meeting the search criteria, “aliases” to the files are created, and these aliases are organized together in a special display window for presenting the results of the search to the computer user. The program which performs the searching, aliasing and organizing function is called a “Viewer.” The Viewer acts as an intelligent folder that continually searches for files meeting a specification supplied by the user. For each file found, an alias is created and this alias appears in the Viewer's folder and window.

The Viewer, however, does not include a customized display schema stored in association with, e.g., a given set of search criteria. Indeed, it appears the Viewer presents items

in accordance to a default view. *See* Thompson-Rohrlich, Figures 2 – 4. **Clearly, Thompson-Rohrlich’s Viewer does not contemplate the storing of a customized view having display elements selected as appropriate for presentation with the items returned by a particular set of search criteria.** Thus, Thompson-Rohrlich fails to teach: “a display schema stored by said shell in association with said category of items, wherein said display schema identifies one or more display attributes selected as appropriate for display with items of said category of items.” [claim 1]; “shell view schema[s] stored in association with said relationship type[s]” [claims 9 and 18]; and “a display schema stored by a shell in association with at least one of said one or more queries” [claim 13]. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 9, 13 and 18 are now in condition for allowance.

Further, Thompson-Rohrlich does not address conflicts between display properties defined by the items and display properties defined by the shell. While the Office Action relies on Thompson-Rohrlich’s discussion of a file “alias” to teach this aspect of the claimed invention (Office Action, p. 7), the concept of an “alias” does not apply to display-property conflicts. Indeed, the disclosed file “alias” is simply a technique for presenting the same file in two file folders (without having to actually copy the file data itself). In contrast, independent claims 9 and 18 require that “conflicts between said shell view schema and said one or more display elements are resolved in favor of said shell view schema.” Thompson-Rohrlich is silent as to the resolution of conflicts between a shell view schema and an item’s own display elements. Obviously, Thompson-Rohrlich does not teach resolving such a conflict in favor of the shell’s view schema. For this additional reason, independent claims 9 and 18 are now in conditional for allowance.

Applicants also submit that dependent claims 2 - 8, which depend from claim 1, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Applicants submit that dependent claims 10 - 12, which depend from claim 9, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 9. Applicants submit that dependent claims 14- 17, which depend from claim 13, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 13. Applicants also submit that dependent claims 19 - 24, which depend from claim 18, are in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 18.

Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, claims 1 – 24 are in condition for allowance. If any issues remain which would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned prior to issuing a subsequent action. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional amount required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Reckers/

Robert Reckers
Reg. No. 54,633

SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Boulevard
Kansas City, Missouri 64108
Phone: 816/474-6550
Fax: 816-421-5547